

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-28 stand rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19-23 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (GB 2,273,131). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Regarding Claims 1-7 and 10, as amended, Claim 1 recites, "An aircraft engine assembly adapted to attenuate noise, said engine assembly comprising: a nacelle including an inlet section coupled to a main section adapted to support an engine and fan assembly therewithin; and a one piece annular acoustic panel that forms a segment of an internal wall of the nacelle, wherein the annular acoustic panel forms at least a portion of the inlet section and a forward portion of the main section."

Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest an aircraft engine assembly including the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. For example, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest an aircraft engine assembly having a one piece annular acoustic panel that forms a segment of an internal wall of an engine nacelle including a forward portion of an inlet section of the nacelle and a forward portion of a main section of the nacelle that supports an engine and fan assembly. Rather, Anderson et al. describes a one-piece acoustic liner *inlet* barrel that has an integral engine mounting flange 20 *to which engine frame 30 is attached at an aft end of the barrel*, as shown in Figs 3 and 5(b). The barrel of Anderson et al. does not form a portion of the engine frame 30. Thus, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest the one piece annular acoustic panel that forms a segment of an internal wall for at least a portion of a nacelle inlet section and a forward portion of a nacelle main section.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over Anderson et al.

Claims 2-7 and 10 depend from amended Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-7 and 10 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 2-7 and 10 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al.

2. Regarding Claims 11-16 and 19, Claim 11 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations in amended Claim 1. In accordance with remarks set forth above with regard to amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 11 is also patentable over Anderson et al.

Claims 12-16 and 19 depend from amended Claim 11. When the recitations of Claims 12-16 and 19 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 11, Applicant submits that Claims 12-16 and 19 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al.

3. Regarding Claims 20-23 and 26-28, as originally presented, Claim 20 recites, "An aircraft adapted to reduce engine noise, said aircraft comprising: an engine assembly, wherein said engine assembly comprises: a nacelle including an inlet section coupled at a main bulkhead to a main section adapted to support an engine and fan assembly therewithin; and a one piece annular acoustic panel integrated within an internal wall of the nacelle, whereby the annular acoustic panel extends from a forward portion of the inlet section to a forward portion of the main section such that the main bulkhead is covered by the annular acoustic panel."

Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest an aircraft including the limitations recited in Claim 20. For example, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest an aircraft having an engine assembly that includes a one piece annular acoustic panel integrated within an internal wall of an engine nacelle, whereby the annular acoustic panel extends from a forward portion of a nacelle inlet section to a forward portion of a nacelle main section such that a main bulkhead is covered by the annular acoustic panel. Rather, Anderson et al. describes a one-piece acoustic liner inlet barrel that has an integral engine mounting flange 20 *to which engine frame 30 is attached at an aft end of the barrel*, as shown in Figs 3 and 5(b). The barrel of Anderson et al. does not cover a bulkhead formed at engine frame 30. Thus, Anderson

et al. does not describe, show or suggest the one piece annular acoustic panel that covers a main bulkhead, as recited in originally presented Claims 20.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20, as originally presented, is patentable over Anderson et al.

Claims 21-23 and 26-28 depend from Claim 20. When the recitations of Claims 21-23 and 26-28 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 20, Applicant submits that Claims 21-23 and 26-28 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al.

Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully request that the section 102 rejections of Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19-23 and 26-28 be withdrawn.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 8, 9, 17, 18, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (GB 2,273,131) in view of Porte (U.S. Pat. No. 6,761,245). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Claims 8 and 9 depend from amended Claim 1. Neither Anderson et al. nor Porte describe, show or suggest the limitations recited in amended Claim 1. As set forth above, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 1. Furthermore, Porte describes an acoustic attenuation piece 1 *that consists of three identical shells 2*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte. When the recitations of Claims 8 and 9 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 8 and 9 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte.

2. Claims 17 and 18 depend from amended Claim 11. Neither Anderson et al. nor Porte describe, show or suggest the limitations recited in amended Claim 11. As set forth above, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 11. Furthermore, Porte describes an acoustic attenuation piece 1 *that consists of three identical shells 2*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that

amended Claim 11 is patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte. When the recitations of Claims 17 and 18 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 11, Applicant submits that Claims 17 and 18 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte.


3. Claims 24 and 25 depend from Claim 20. Neither Anderson et al. nor Porte describe, show or suggest the limitations recited in Claim 20. As set forth above, Anderson et al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of Claim 20. Furthermore, Porte describes an acoustic attenuation piece 1 *that consists of three identical shells* 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 20 is patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte. When the recitations of Claims 24 and 25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 20, Applicant submits that Claims 24 and 25 are likewise patentable over Anderson et al. in view of Porte.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7525.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12/14/04

By:   
Scott Gray, Reg. No. 48,891

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
(314) 726-7500